

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 23-28, 42, 44, and 48 are pending in this application.

Please enter the amendments to claims 1-4, 23-28, 42, 44, and 48. These amendments further clarify the claims. Support for these amendments is found throughout the as-filed application. Support for the amendment to claim 1 is found, for example, on page 29, line 26 through page 30, line 8 of the as-filed application. Applicants believe that the amendments place the claims in condition for allowance, or at least simplify issues for appeal. No new matter has been added.

The remaining claims are unchanged.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 48 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 48 is amended, providing antecedent basis for “said ticket printer.”

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 23-28, 42, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0151363 (Letovsky) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0186858 (McGovern).

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection in view of the amendments and the following remarks. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 recites in part an operational event controller that is part of a network computer:

said operational event controller being configured to periodically check with a first gaming apparatus to determine when an operational event has occurred,

said operational event controller being configured to retrieve operational event data,

said operational event controller being configured to permanently store said operational event data on said single-write data storage device, and

said operational event controller being configured to communicate said operational event data to said server computer upon a request from said server computer for said operational event data.

Operational event data includes “accounting data, cashless data, security data, player tracking data and maintenance data,” as recited in claim 1 and explained on page 5, line 30 through page 6, line 11 of the as-filed application.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the statement of page 3 of the Office Action that “all of the limitations are taught by the system of Letovsky.” As explained in the response filed 10 July 2009, the operational event controller is an active component, and nowhere does Letovsky describe an operational event controller with the functionality as recited in claim 1. Further, claim 1 was amended in the response filed 10 July 2009 to recite “said operational event controller being configured to periodically check with a gaming apparatus to determine if an operational event has occurred.” The Office Action cites paragraphs 0027 and 0039 in Letovsky as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 4.) Paragraph 0027 states, in pertinent part:

Upon access to the remote user computer 2 of the remote gaming apparatus 1, a gaming server 60 may poll the wagering devices 50 in order to determine availability and may query a player's account stored in back office financial data server 10 as is depicted in FIG. 3. In another embodiment represented by FIG. 4, a routing/traffic management server 90 may poll the gaming servers 60 in order to determine availability and may query a player's account in any of the financial servers.

Paragraph 0039 states, in pertinent part:

In one aspect, to gain access to a wagering device 501 of the invention, a gaming server 601 via relay interface and game data serial link 111 may poll one or more wagering devices 501 to determine availability and may query a player's account for account information and available funds.

Thus, paragraphs 0027 and 0039 in Letovsky both state that the gaming server may poll wagering devices to determine the availability of a wagering device to provide a game at a remote location and query a player's account for account information and available funds. This has nothing to do with an operational event controller periodically checking “with a gaming apparatus to determine when an operational event has occurred.” (Claim 1.)

McGovern is cited for its teachings with respect to a write-once device to permanently store data on a network system, but not with respect to an “operational event controller being configured to periodically check with a gaming apparatus to determine if an operational event has occurred.” (Claim 1.) Because the Office Action does not set forth a rejection of this feature in view of McGovern, claim 1 is patentable for at least this reason.

Furthermore, in order to advance prosecution, claim 1 is amended. Claim 1, as amended, recites in part a server computer, a network computer, a plurality of gaming apparatuses, and “a second data storage device operatively coupled to said network computer, the second data storage device configured store said operational event data stored on the

single-write data storage device.” As explained on page 29, line 26 through page 30, line 8 of the as-filed application, if the single-write storage device fails, the remaining second data storage device may provide a copy of the operational event data stored on the failed single-write data storage device. That is, the second data storage device acts as a backup to the single-write storage device.

Letovsky describes an apparatus that allows a player remotely located from wagering devices to make wagers on the wagering devices using funds on deposit in an account. (Abstract). Letovsky does not, however, describe a server computer, a network computer, and a plurality of gaming apparatuses that function as recited in claim 1, as explained above and in the response filed 10 July 2009. Further, while Letovsky describes an event archive backup library, Letovsky does not describe “a second data storage device operatively coupled to said server computer, the second data storage device configured store said operational event data stored on the single-write data storage device” as recited in claim 1.

As explained above, McGovern is cited for its teachings with respect to a write-once device to permanently store data on a network system, but not with respect to the other features recited in claim 1. Thus, Letovsky and McGovern, considered alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited claim 1. Claim 1 is therefore not obvious in view of Letovsky and McGovern.

The dependent claims incorporate the features of independent claim 1. The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Furthermore, at least some of the dependent claims are patentable on their own merits because the combination of Letovsky and McGovern does not teach the features of these claims. For example, claim 23 recites a second gaming apparatus. A second gaming apparatus (claim 23) is different from a first gaming apparatus (claim 1) in that a second gaming apparatus includes “a second single-write data storage device configured to store data representing operational events.” Thus, each gaming machine stores its own operational event data on a single-write storage device. Nowhere do Letovsky and McGovern teach a gaming apparatus including “a second single-write data storage device,” as recited in claim 23.

As another example, claim 25 recites that a second controller of a second gaming apparatus “is configured to communicate said operational event data to a third data storage device of at least one of said second plurality of second gaming apparatuses.” Having one gaming apparatus store operational event data for a number of gaming apparatus provides a

backup of the operational event data. Nowhere do Letovsky and McGovern teach a gaming apparatus including “a third data storage device” as recited in claim 23.

Conclusion

The claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, allowance of the claims at the earliest possible date is requested.

If prosecution of this application can be assisted by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorneys at (510) 663-1100.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are required to facilitate the filing of this Amendment. However, if it is determined that such fees are due, please charge such additional fees to Deposit Account No. 504480 (Order No. IGT1P545).

Respectfully submitted,
WEAVER AUSTIN VILLENEUVE & SAMPSON LLP

/Jeffrey K. Weaver/
Jeffrey K. Weaver
Reg. No. 31,314

/Stephen C. Glade/
Stephen C. Glade
Reg. No. 57,601

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100